

The authors have done an excellent job at improving the focus of the paper, the introduction and generally across the manuscript. I have a couple of suggestions for further improvements to the introduction that are at the discretion of the author, and some minor comments across the manuscript that will need to be addressed prior to publication.

Optional suggestion 1: I recommend using quotation marks the first time that you use the terms referring to the key techniques used in the paper.

Line 25: (referred to as the “hydrograph calibration” hereafter)

Line 47: (referred to as the “FDC calibration” hereafter)

Line 62: (referred to as “RFDC_cal” hereafter)

This makes it clear to the reader the general term that you will be using to describe these techniques throughout the rest of the manuscript. If they get lost in the methodology and results then they can easily find where you define these terms in the introduction.

Optional suggestion 2: Add a table/figure summarising (in columns) the key methods (e.g. “hydrograph calibration”, “FDC calibration”, “RFDC_cal”) the key references for these methods, the key strengths, the key weaknesses and gaps in literature. This will give the reader a bit of a road-map of the introduction and make it easier to see the research gap that you are trying to address.

Minor comments:

1. Line 136: “and thus can worsen the equifinality” without providing evidence or a reference I suggest removing this statement.
2. Line 177: For completeness I suggest also mentioning the BATEA uncertainty estimation methodology of Kuczera et al (2006).
3. Line 154: I suggest being a bit more descriptive about your methods than using the term “Monte-Carlo random sampling” or to reference a particular methodology that you used for implementing this broad technique. This is important to ensure the reproducibility of the work.
4. Line 333: “Catchment 2” is a bit vague now that you have removed the previous version of the manuscript “Table 1” that listed the catchments. I recommend using the catchment name here i.e. “Namgang Dam” and also in the Figure 6 caption, to again ensure the reproducibility of the work.
5. Line 374: I recommend referring to Table 3 much earlier in this section (at the beginning if possible) so that the reader knows what you are referring to.

A few typos:

1. Line 75: “reginal” to “regional”
2. Line 94: (Optional) My preference is to not start a section/paragraph with a numerical number.
3. Line 271: “rainfalls” to “rainfall” to be consistent with earlier in the sentence.
4. Line 461: “combining” to “combine”